

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 are rejected by the Examiner. Claims 1-26 are still pending. Claims 10, 11 and 24 have been amended. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the amendments above and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,857,201 issued to Wright et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Wright"). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Wright discloses improving upon the then current nature of client/server applications to depend on persistent connections with enterprise data sources and resources. More particularly, Wright discloses an improved system whereby software programs are permitted to utilize occasional connections in lieu of persistent connections and which are further permitted to operate over low-performance, low-overhead communication channels. In proposing their method, the inventors of Wright detail a programmatic solution directed to improving the capability of custom designed program.

As described in the specification of the present application, programmatic solutions are fraught with disadvantages. In one aspect, programmatic models such as that proposed in Wright are characterized by their inflexibility. In addition, programmatic models, including the one disclosed in Wright, are highly procedural, functioning as a layer underneath custom programs and reacting directly to commands and messages issued by these programs. The primary, if not sole, functionality and value in such systems is limited and driven by the custom-developed code utilizing the services, further reflecting their inherent inflexibility. In a particular instantiation of a system such as that proposed in Wright, a hard-wired connection with a specific resource back-end, such as the remote database access and data synchronization resources referenced in Wright, is typically required. Finally, while a system such as that proposed in Wright may often be utilized for a number of enterprise data sources, the means by which such utilization may be effected relies on significant supplementary programming whenever requirements or a source is changed.

Rather than rely on data synching or such programmatic solutions as the one proposed by Wright, the present invention is unique in at least the aspect that it defines and leverages the concept of mobile data models. The concept of a mobile data model as defined and claimed in the present application is not anticipated, disclosed, taught or otherwise suggested in Wright.

As described in the specification of the present application, a mobile data model is distinguishable from the programmatic model of Wright in a number of respects. Significantly, the mobile data model of the present invention can be starkly contrasted with the programmatic model of Wright in at least the respect that the mobile data model of the present invention is decoupled from a particular client interface or enterprise data source. In addition to being decoupled from a particular client interface or enterprise data source, the present invention can be differentiated from Wright's proposed solution through the present invention's utilization of a mobile data model capable of independently describing key details required by a mobile application, including transactions, connections between individual data elements, relationships and dependency relationships, as well as distribution attributes.

In light of the above, it is clear that Wright fails to anticipate, disclose, teach or otherwise suggest a method for use of a software application comprising, among other elements, accessing a mobile data model, at least a portion of the mobile data model suitable to be instantiated at a distributed device to create a mobile data store containing enterprise information on the distributed device as claimed in claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the rejection to Claim 1, withdraw the rejection and allow Claim 1 to issue.

Claims 2-10 depend from and provide further patentable limitations to independent Claim 1. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the rejection to Claims 2-10, withdraw the rejections and allow Claims 2-10.

Similarly, Wright fails to anticipate, disclose, teach or otherwise suggest a system for application development in a mobile domain comprising, among other elements, a decoupled mobile data model, a portion of the decoupled mobile data model suitable to be instantiated at a distributed computing platform to create a mobile data store containing enterprise information at the distributed computing platform as claimed in claim 11. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the rejection to Claim 11, withdraw the rejection and allow Claim 11 to issue.

Application No. 09/848,770
Amendment dated January 13, 2004
Reply to Office Action of July 13, 2004

Claims 12-16 depend from and provide further patentable limitations to independent Claim 11. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the rejections to Claims 12-16, withdraw the rejections and allow Claims 12-16.

Further, Wright fails to anticipate, disclose, teach or otherwise suggest a system comprising, among other elements, a memory associated with the distributed computing platform, the memory storing a mobile data store comprising information indicative of information in an enterprise backend, the mobile data store representing an instantiation of at least a portion of a mobile data model as claimed in claim 17. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the rejection to Claim 17, withdraw the rejection and allow Claim 17 to issue.

Claims 18-21 depend from and provide further patentable limitations to independent Claim 17. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the rejections to Claims 18-21, withdraw the rejections and allow Claims 18-21.

In addition, Wright fails to anticipate, disclose, teach or otherwise suggest a method for application deployment comprising, among other elements, communicating a client-side application and a portion of a deployable mobile data model to the mobile computing device as claimed in claim 22. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the rejection to Claim 22, withdraw the rejection and allow Claim 22 to issue.

Claim 23 depends from and provides further patentable limitations to independent Claim 22. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the rejection to Claim 23, withdraw the rejection and allow Claim 23.

Finally, Wright fails to anticipate, disclose, teach or otherwise suggest a method for application development and deployment comprising, among other elements, developing a mobile data model, the mobile data model decoupled from a particular client interface and enterprise data source as claimed in claim 24. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the rejection to Claim 24, withdraw the rejection and allow Claim 24 to issue.

Claims 25-26 depend from and provide further patentable limitations to independent Claim 24. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the rejections to Claims 25-26, withdraw the rejections and allow Claims 25-26.

Application No. 09/848,770
Amendment dated January 13, 2004
Reply to Office Action of July 13, 2004

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112

The Examiner rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicants have amended claim 10. As such, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner reconsider claim 10, withdraw the rejection and allow claim 10.

Double Patenting Rejections

The Examiner provisionally rejected Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9, 10 and 17-21 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-18 of co-pending Application No. 09/848,970. The Examiner provisionally rejected Claims 1-3, and 7 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 6 and 13 of co-pending Application No. 09/848,952. The Examiner provisionally rejected Claims 1-3, and 6-9 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3, 5, 6, and 11 of co-pending Application No. 09/848,769.

Filed herewith in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) is a Terminal Disclaimers covering co-pending Application No. 09/848,970. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection of claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9, 10 and 17-21.

Filed herewith in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) is a Terminal Disclaimers covering co-pending Application No. 09/848,952. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection of claims 1, 6 and 13.

Filed herewith in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) is a Terminal Disclaimers covering co-pending Application No. 09/848,769. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection of claims 1-3 and 6-9.

Application No. 09/848,770
Amendment dated January 13, 2004
Reply to Office Action of July 13, 2004

CONCLUSION

In light of the remarks set forth above, Applicants believe that they are entitled to a letters patent in the present matter. Applicants respectfully solicit the Examiner to expedite prosecution of this patent application to issuance. Should the Examiner have any questions or feel that further prosecution of this matter may be expedited through an interview, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, including petition fees and extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 23-2415 (Docket No. 26625-704).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 13, 2005

By:



Brian A. Dietzel

Registration No. 44,656

WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
650 Page Mill Road
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1050
(512) 338-5423
Client No. 021971

Application No. 09/848,770
Amendment dated January 13, 2004
Reply to Office Action of July 13, 2004

Amendments to the Figures

The Examiner objected to Figures 1-4, and 11-16. Figures 11 and 14 were objected to as containing grayscale images that do not produce satisfactory reproduction. Figures 1-4, 11-13, 15 and 16 were objected to as containing text less than 1/8 of an inch in height.

Figures 1-4, 11-13, 15 and 16 have been revised to increase the size of the text contained therein. Replacement sheets for Figures 1-4, 11-13, 15 and 16 are attached hereto in Exhibit A.

Figures 11 and 14 have been revised to remove the grayscale portions included therein. Replacement sheets for Figures 11 and 14 are attached hereto in Exhibit A. Applicants respectfully submit that the Replacements Sheets for Figures 1-4 and 11-16 introduce no new subject matter in the present application. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the objections to Figures 1-4 and 11-16 and withdraw the objections. Finally, Applicants will submit formal illustrations of the Figures upon the Examiner's allowance of one or more claims.

EXHIBIT A